



Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Review  
Public Scoping Meeting Comments

Oct. 1, 2008  
6 – 9 p.m.  
A-Ka-Lat Center, La Push, WA

In all, 24 people attended the meeting (excluding sanctuary staff). However, several people attended only the first hour of the meeting, which was an open house, and did not stay long enough to provide official comments. Those who stayed were divided into two discussion groups. Each group was facilitated by a sanctuary staff member. An additional staff member served as note-taker. Discussion groups sat around tables facing projected Microsoft Word blank document pages. Facilitators each asked their groups, “what should be Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary’s priorities for the next 5 to 10 years? Note-takers typed each group member’s comments so that the entire group could see them. Facilitators checked in with each participant to verify that his/her typed comments were accurate; the participants could then request changes to the wording. Here are the responses from each group.

**Group #1**

Facilitator: Helene Scalliet

Note-taker: Andy Palmer

- Continue to promote a healthy ecosystem in the sanctuary, using the best science to promote a healthy habitat for sea life, good water quality.
- Build partnerships and better relationships with the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) and local communities through integrated activities that are relevant to local concerns. We can do better than we are currently doing.
- Promote the sanctuary to allow and permit tours of the sanctuary be it marine wildlife. When people are in the sanctuary they can be more appreciative of the resources. This is not currently happening.
- Develop relationships and programs utilizing experiential learning with coastal school districts. This includes the Cape Flattery, Quileute, Taholah and Queets/Clearwater school districts. There is currently no interaction between the sanctuary and these school districts.
- The sanctuary should create hands-on activities with teens empowering them to learn more about the marine environment within the coastal school districts.

- The sanctuary should partner more with the Feiro Marine Science Center to collaborate with the educational service districts on programs aimed at creating programs that are transportable to the field.
- I support the management plan goals that are currently in place. Specific to resource protection to require rather than merely encourage coordination on research studies, be it tribes or other agencies.
- The sanctuary should be a centralized data gathering body for all research related to the sanctuary. Permits should require researchers to bring their data back to the sanctuary.
- Respect rights of indigenous populations to utilize the ocean for their livelihood. They were here before the sanctuary was created and have the right to pursue their subsistence and harvest rights and the right to management of those resources.
- Conduct ecosystem inventory and assessment and analysis by the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) and the sanctuary. There is currently a lack of data and data integration.
- The sanctuary should promote wave-energy research and the capturing of that energy because of current and future energy needs.
- The sanctuary should focus research programs to conduct monitoring on decadal scale. The program needs to be sufficient to conduct continuous long-term monitoring. The current research programs are not focused enough (i.e. detect changes cause by climate changes).
- The sanctuary should be as transparent as possible so that the community feels it understands what is going on. If an issue comes up, the general public has a voice in the decision-making.
- The sanctuary is of concern to the rest of the nation, because it is a national treasure.
- The sanctuary advisory council needs to be more publicized and emphasized as a means of communication between the sanctuary and the public.
- The sanctuary should remain neutral on fishery management regulatory actions and leave the management to the co-managers of the fisheries.
- The sanctuary should work with Olympic National Park to establish protected zones where harvesting is not permitted by non-indigenous people. There has been damage to some intertidal resources.
- The sanctuary should support continuous training for members in communities adjacent to the sanctuary for response to catastrophic events, for example oil spills and tsunamis.
- The education goal in the present management plan “to foster involvement by encouraging feedback on the effectiveness of education programs .....” needs to have action plan that details the program that are in place to meet that goal. This action plan should be easily accessible through the website.
- The sanctuary office should be adjacent to the sanctuary instead of the current, relatively remote location. Other resource management agencies are located near their activities. Ideal areas would be Forks or La Push.
- Continue working with Olympic National Park to remove marine debris annually.

- The sanctuary should develop data standards that provide for data and interpretation of the data to be translatable and available to resource managers in a timely fashion.
- The Washington Clean Coast Alliance (WCCA) work should be continued on marine debris.
- The Navy should not be conducting exercises in the sanctuary.
- Continue underwater research and integrate information into existing education programs in coordination with Olympic National Park and others. Understanding resources helps the public value the sanctuary.
- Support the development of new technologies to investigate marine ecosystems structure and function.

## **Group #2**

Facilitator: Jacqueline Laverdure

Note-taker: Lauren Bennett

- Wildlife Conservation
- Pollution Response and Prevention
- Public Education/Outreach: it is important for the sanctuary to focus on public education in coastal communities/schools regarding the environment.
- Communication: we need to communicate what our goals and objectives are.
- Coordination: we all need to have an understanding of how to develop processes. For example, better coordination can lead to more effective involvement.
- Collaboration: we need to put more emphasis on collaboration and bringing all of the entities together so that everyone has an equal voice.
- What I would like to come out of the management plan is a shared/joint understanding of what the sanctuary should be. As we revise the management plan, we need to be cognizant/respectful/reflective of the specific needs on the WA coast.
  - We should survey the habitats and species to understand better what lives in the sanctuary and where. Habitat mapping is key.
  - We should identify to the best of our ability what is the condition of those resources.
  - We should determine what the local communities think the conditions of the sanctuary ought to be (what the goals for those resources should be in perpetuity).
  - We should jointly identify what we think the threats to those resources are. We should jointly identify strategies for management and uses in the sanctuary.
  - The emphasis needs to be on joint understanding, joint management.
- The sanctuary needs to flesh out the way it represents the tribes to the public. The sanctuary needs to update the representation of the tribes; the tribes are more than just their heritage. The tribes are involved in modern technology and current management processes. The tribes are only portrayed in an 1855 cast, and that leads to misunderstandings among the public.

- When sanctuary volunteers are trained, they need to be trained about tribal treaty rights. The volunteers are representing the sanctuary.
- There was a crane that fell a few years ago, and there may be possible pollution as a result (smelt populations have decreased).
- There need to be proper bathrooms along the beach to protect water quality.
- The sanctuary should not take away from native rights (in particular the right to harvest food).
- Preservation, conservation and stewardship of the environment. These priorities are shared between the tribes and NOAA and should be sanctuary priorities.
- The sanctuary needs to acknowledge and recognize the Intergovernmental Policy Council members as co-managers.
- Given climate change, it is important for the sanctuary to be open to the alternative energy industry and the sanctuary needs to engage industries in a continual dialog and find a way to make things work compatibly.
- Right now, there is friction between the sanctuary and certain groups; and the more dialogue that can occur, the better. Continual, repeated dialogue is key to the successful resolution of these frictions.
- The sanctuary is living in an overlay of jurisdictional authorities. The sanctuary is not autonomous and should improve how it works with these other authorities.
- It would be helpful if the sanctuary could clarify on its website how all of the entities with jurisdiction within the sanctuary boundaries interact and/or have operating agreements.
- There needs to be a better understanding of what the sanctuary's roles, functions and authorities are.
- More/better public education could help improve the understanding of what the sanctuary is and what the sanctuary's capabilities are.
- More communication between the agencies/organizations that have overlapping jurisdiction in the sanctuary would be beneficial (more interagency communication).
- The Nature Conservancy has a strong interest in sharing information/data about the Olympic Coast eco-region and working with partners on the Olympic Coast.
- The sanctuary should make its data/research more accessible to the public and others.
- We need to improve communication between the entities within the sanctuary boundaries in order to develop mutual respect.
- The sanctuary knows its strengths and weaknesses. The sanctuary should reflect on these strengths and weaknesses and communicate them to its partners. This would add value to the sanctuary.